REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 3 and 5 are objected due to wording informalities.

Claims 1 and 4 have been rejected under 35 USC102(e) over Widegren.

Claim 3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 USC103(a) over Widegren in view of Architectural Aspects for the Evolution of Mobile Communications Towards UMTS by Berruto.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 USC103(a) over Widegren further in view of Boudreaux.

Claim 1

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has now incorrectly interpreted Widegren column 12 lines 12-32.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's earlier assertion that "Widegren does not expressly call for: two core networks having the same functionality" is correct (see numbered paragraph 3 of office action mailed January 24, 2007).

Widegren column 12 lines 13 to 32 does not teach that "The UMTS manages core networks even if they come from different core networks". What appears the relevant sentence in column 12 lines 13 to 32, namely lines 18-20, states "UTRAN manages multiple bearers related to one mobile station terminal even if they come from different core networks". How the "Examiner interprets that this means that the UMTS inherently manages core network which have the same functionality" is not sufficiently reasoned to be understood.

In this regard, Widegren Figure 1 shows a single PSTN/ISDN network, and in the associated text, namely column 5 line 28 to column 7 line 40, discloses a single "representative, connection-orientated external core network, shown as a cloud 12, may be for example the Publication Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) and/or the Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN)" (emphasis added). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's assertion that "there would be two ISDN

networks each with D channels" is contrary to the teaching of Widegren, and unsupported by evidence.

The skilled reader learns from Figure 1 of Widegren of two core networks which are of different functionality, the PSTN/ISDN core network 12 and the INTERNET core network 14. In contrast claim 1 requires at least two core networks having the same functionality.

Furthermore, as mentioned in e.g Widegren column 5 lines 38 to 49, PSTN/ISDN is connection-orientated (i.e. circuit switched) whilst Internet is connectionless (packet-switched). It follows that Widegren does not disclose a packet switched network architecture comprising ... two core networks.

Furthermore, Claim 1 is also distinguished over Widegren in that "the radio access network switches packet transmissions from each terminal to one of the at least two core networks in dependence on the capacity of the respective networks" (emphasis added).

Widegren relates primarily to appropriate assignment of radio bearers dependent on quality of service desired for a call. However, in its column 6 lines 54 to 59 it states:

> "A service from the core network service node is requested using a signaling connection between the mobile station and the core network service node. The signaling connection may be set up in response to a page from the core network, activation of a service in the mobile station, or by some other procedure, e.g., a location update.".

This would appear to suggest choosing a core network from core networks of different functionality (ISDN or Internet) based on the desired quality of service for a call. ISDN inherently provides guaranteed voice quality of service whilst Internet inherently provides a "Best Effort" quality of service. Accordingly, for example, the IDSN network will be selected for a voice service whilst Internet will be chosen for a web-browsing session. Although network capacity is one of many factors that can affect

the actual quality of service experienced in practice by a particular call, there is no teaching or suggestion of switching to a core network dependent on the capacity of the respective core networks.

Claim 3

The objections to wording in claim 3 have been addressed by amendment.

Claim 3 is patentable not least on the basis that it depends on an allowable amended claim 1.

Claim 4

Claim 4 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 1. Claim 4 is patentable for the same reasons as laid-out in respect of claim 1 above.

Claim 5

Claim 5 is canceled

Claim 6

Claim 6 is canceled.

Claim 7

A minor clarification of wording has been made to claim 7.

Claim 7 is allowable not least on the basis that it is dependent on an allowable independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all the claims presently in the application is respectfully requested, as is passage to issuance of the application. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact Applicants' attorney, **John B. MacIntyre**, at **630 979 46327** .

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Roberts
Sutha Sivagnanasundaram

By: John B. MacIntyre
John B. MacIntyre, Attorney
Reg. No. 41170
Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 2/15/08

Send all correspondence to:
Docket Administrator (Room 2F-192)
Alcatel-Lucent
600-700 Mountain Ave.
P.O. Box 636.
Murray Hill, NJ 07974-0636